SB

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/689,500	10/11/2000	Charles Graham	004737.P001	6211

8791 7590 01/28/2004

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER	
TRAN, PHILIP B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	13

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/689,500	GRAHAM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip B Tran	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover she t with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 November 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9-21 and 24-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9,12-21, 24-27 and 32-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) *10,11 and 28-31* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-4, 9, 13-18, 20, 24-26 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs et al (Hereafter, Jacobs), "Filling HTML Forms Simultaneously : CoWeb - Architecture and Functionality", Computer Networks and ISDN Systems, NL, North Holland Publishing, Amsterdam, Vol. 28, No. 7-11, pages 1385-1395, May 1996 in view of Anupam et al (Hereafter, Anupam), U.S. Pat. No. 6,360,250.

Regarding claim 1, Jacobs teaches a method for exchanging information over a communications network, the method comprising:

connecting at least two clients (= CoWeb clients) to a proxy (= CoWeb server) over the communications network (i.e., two CoWeb clients connect to a CoWeb server which is connected to the WWW server) [see Fig. 2]; and

activating a shared session between the at least two clients (i.e., CoWeb server manages all communication between the clients and allows several clients to participate in a CoWeb session) [see Sec. 3.1.3];

retrieving at least one web document pertaining to the shared session from a web site (i.e., loading a document in a CoWeb session from the original WWW server through the CoWeb server) [see Fig. 2 and Sec. 3.2.3]; and

enabling co-navigation of at least one web document with dynamic content by the at least two clients during the shared session (i.e., providing collaborative web page navigation for CoWeb clients and guaranteeing that all users deal with the same state of the document) [see Abstract and Secs. 3.1.3 and 3.2.4].

Jacobs does not explicitly teach modifying the at least one web document with dynamic content associated with one or more references to the web site with one or more references to the proxy, the dynamic content depending at least partially on information stored outside of said web site. However, Jacobs does suggest modifying HTML documents received from the WWW server (= Web site) and offering cooperative functionality by the CoWeb server (= proxy) by replacing HTML types with applets for a continuously changing web [see Figs. 2-3 and Secs. 2, 3.1, 3.1.2].

Anupam, in the same field of co-navigation endeavor, discloses monitoring the activities of collaborators by periodically checking the changed or modified document/form on one user and enabling the simultaneous updates to another user in a collaborative session [see Col. 5, Lines 37-51]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate implementation of making modifications to the web document and transmitting those changes to the other collaborators in a collaborative session, disclosed by Anupam, into the exchanging information system with CoWeb server disclosed by Jacobs, in order to enable the synchronization of the most updated web document while enhancing the collaborators to interactively communicate with each others in real-time.

Regarding claim 2, Jacobs further teach the method of claim 1 wherein the at least two clients include at least one customer (= employee who wants to purchase a new computer) and at least one company representative (= administrative personnel of purchasing department) [see Sec. 4.2].

Regarding claim 3, Jacobs further teaches the method of claim 1 wherein connecting the at least two clients to the proxy includes receiving a message from any of the at least two clients, the message indicating a willingness to begin the shared session (i.e., sending a message to the CoWeb server and cooperating with all other participants of the same session) [see Secs. 3.1.3 and 3.2 and 3.2.2].

Regarding claim 4, Jacobs further teaches the method of claim 1 wherein activating the shared session between the at least two clients further includes collecting client state information and synchronizing browsers of the at least two clients using the client state information (i.e., the CoWeb server manages communication messages between the clients for cooperative functionality by checking status of client if a user is switching navigation from one document to another and cooperating all users to perform the same switch [see Fig. 2 and Secs. 3.1 and 3.2.4]. This implies that an Internet address of web document and relevant information from the web document are monitored and thus performing synchronization of browsers of two clients.

Regarding claim 9, Jacobs further teaches identifying a dynamic event (= continuously changing web by replacing HTTP types with applets) in the at least one web document and replacing a link directing the dynamic event to the web site with a link or code directing the dynamic event to a proxy (i.e., modifying HTML documents received from the WWW server (= Web site) and offering cooperative functionality by the CoWeb server (= proxy) by replacing HTML types with applets for a continuously changing web) [see Figs. 2-3 and Secs. 2, 3.1, 3.1.2].

Regarding claim 13, Jacobs further teaches the method of claim 1 wherein co-navigating includes jointly completing a web form by the at least two clients (i.e., filling HTML forms simultaneously) [see Secs. 3.2.4 and 4.2].

Regarding claim 14, Jacobs further teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising:

a first client specifying an object on a web document displayed to the first client during the shared session, and displaying the object on a web document displayed to a second client (i.e., one user displays the same part of the document as all other clients and when another user jumps to another part of the document by following an internal link then he simultaneously performs the same switch) [see Sec. 3.2.5].

Regarding claim 15, Jacobs further teaches the method of claim 14 comprising scrolling the web document displayed to the second client to a portion of the web document that includes the object (i.e., scrolling means on the cooperating control panel) [see Fig. 4].

Regarding claim 16, Jacobs further teaches the method of claim 1 comprising selectively restricting web features from any of the at least two clients during the shared session (i.e., private document is being read-only type and only the owner has the possibility to change it) [see Sec. 3.2.5].

Regarding claim 17, Jacobs further teaches the method of claim 1 comprising selectively enabling web features from any of the at least two clients during the shared session (i.e., CoWeb offers cooperative functionality through

applets and different cooperation modes during the shared session) [see Secs. 3.2.4 and 3.2.5].

Regarding claim 18, Jacobs further teaches the method of claim 1 comprising selectively blocking personal information of a first client from a second client during the shared session (i.e., private document is being read-only type and only the owner has the possibility to change it) [see Sec. 3.2.5].

Regarding claim 20, Jacobs further teaches the method of claim 1 comprising providing going back and forward functionality during the shared session (i.e., scrolling means on the cooperating control panel) [see Fig. 4].

Regarding claim 24, Jacobs teaches a system for exchanging information over a communications network, the system comprising :

a first client device (= CoWeb client), connected to the communications network and a second client device(= CoWeb client), connected to the communications network (i.e., two CoWeb clients connect to a CoWeb server which is connected to the WWW server) [see Fig. 2], to issue a message indicating a willingness to begin a shared session (i.e., sending a message to the CoWeb server and cooperating with all other participants of the same session) [see Secs. 3.1.3 and 3.2 and 3.2.2]; and

a co-navigation service (= CoWeb server), connected to the communications network, to receive the message from the second client device,

to activate the shared session between at least a user of the first client device and a user of the second client device (i.e., CoWeb server manages all communication between the clients and allows several clients to participate in a CoWeb session) [see Sec. 3.1.3], to retrieve at least one web document pertaining to the shared session from a web site (i.e., loading a document in a CoWeb session from the original WWW server through the CoWeb server) [see Fig. 2 and Sec. 3.2.3], and to enable co-navigation of the at least one web document with the dynamic content by at least the user of the first client device and the user of the second client device during the shared session (i.e., providing collaborative web page navigation for CoWeb clients and guaranteeing that all users deal with the same state of the document) [see Abstract and Secs. 3.1.3 and 3.2.4].

Jacobs does not explicitly teach modifying the at least one web document with dynamic content associated with one or more references to the web site with one or more references to the proxy, the dynamic content depending at least partially on information stored outside of said web site. However, Jacobs does suggest modifying HTML documents received from the WWW server (= Web site) and offering cooperative functionality by the CoWeb server (= proxy) by replacing HTML types with applets for a continuously changing web [see Figs. 2-3 and Secs. 2, 3.1, 3.1.2].

Anupam, in the same field of co-navigation endeavor, discloses monitoring the activities of collaborators by periodically checking the changed or modified document/form on one user and enabling the simultaneous updates to another

user in a collaborative session [see Col. 5, Lines 37-51]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate implementation of making modifications to the web document and transmitting those changes to the other collaborators in a collaborative session, disclosed by Anupam, into the exchanging information system with CoWeb server disclosed by Jacobs, in order to enable the synchronization of the most updated web document while enhancing the collaborators to interactively communicate with each others in real-time.

Regarding claim 25, Jacobs further teach the system of claim 24 wherein the user of the first client device is a company representative (= administrative personnel of purchasing department), and the user of the second client device is a customer (= employee who wants to purchase a new computer) [see Sec. 4.2].

Regarding claim 26, Jacobs further teaches the system of claim 24 wherein an applet to establish connection with the co-navigation service (= CoWeb server) (i.e., java applets), and a shared browser to present the at least one web document to a user (i.e., browser) [see Figs. 2-3 and Secs. 3.1, 3.1.1, 3.1.2].

Regarding claim 34, Jacobs teaches a computer readable medium comprising instructions, which when executed on a processor, perform a method

for exchanging information over a communications network, the method comprising :

connecting at least two clients (= CoWeb clients) to a proxy (= CoWeb server) over the communications network (i.e., two CoWeb clients connect to a CoWeb server which is connected to the WWW server) [see Fig. 2]; and

activating a shared session between the at least two clients (i.e., CoWeb server manages all communication between the clients and allows several clients to participate in a CoWeb session) [see Sec. 3.1.3];

retrieving at least one web document pertaining to the shared session from a web site (i.e., loading a document in a CoWeb session from the original WWW server through the CoWeb server) [see Fig. 2 and Sec. 3.2.3]; and

enabling co-navigation of at least one web document with dynamic content by the at least two clients during the shared session (i.e., providing collaborative web page navigation for CoWeb clients and guaranteeing that all users deal with the same state of the document) [see Abstract and Secs. 3.1.3 and 3.2.4].

Jacobs does not explicitly teach modifying the at least one web document with dynamic content associated with one or more references to the web site with one or more references to the proxy, the dynamic content depending at least partially on information stored outside of said web site. However, Jacobs does suggest modifying HTML documents received from the WWW server (= Web site) and offering cooperative functionality by the CoWeb server (= proxy) by replacing HTML types with applets for a continuously changing web [see Figs. 2-3 and Secs. 2, 3.1, 3.1.2].

Anupam, in the same field of co-navigation endeavor, discloses monitoring the activities of collaborators by periodically checking the changed or modified document/form on one user and enabling the simultaneous updates to another user in a collaborative session [see Col. 5, Lines 37-51]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate implementation of making modifications to the web document and transmitting those changes to the other collaborators in a collaborative session, disclosed by Anupam, into the exchanging information system with CoWeb server disclosed by Jacobs, in order to enable the synchronization of the most updated web document while enhancing the collaborators to interactively communicate with each others in real-time.

3. Claims 5-6, 19 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs et al (Hereafter, Jacobs), "Filling HTML Forms Simultaneously : CoWeb - Architecture and Functionality", Computer Networks and ISDN Systems, NL, North Holland Publishing, Amsterdam, Vol. 28, No. 7-11, pages 1385-1395, May 1996 in view of Anupam et al (Hereafter, Anupam), U.S. Pat. No. 6,360,250 and further in view of Bakshi et al (Hereafter, Bakshi), U.S. Pat. No. 6,345,300.

Regarding claim 5, Jacobs and Anupam do not explicitly teach the client state information includes a client cookie, an Internet address of a current web document displayed to a client, and relevant information from the current web document. However, Jacob does suggest that the CoWeb server manages

communication messages between the clients for cooperative functionality by checking status of client if a user is switching navigation from one document to another [see Secs. 3.1 and 3.2.4]. This implies that an Internet address of web document and relevant information from the web document are monitored.

Bakshi, in the same field of collaborative network endeavor, discloses the client state information such as client cookie is collected [see Col. 3, Lines 1-30 and Col. 6, Lines 1-35]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of collecting client cookie, disclosed by Bakshi, into the exchanging information system with CoWeb server disclosed by Jacobs, in order to maintain updated client state at the proxy for managing web document downloading request in accordance with the user preference [see Col. 3, Lines 1-30].

Regarding claim 6, Jacobs and Anupam do not explicitly teach any of the at least two clients is behind a firewall. However, Bakshi, in the same field of collaborative network endeavor, discloses the use of firewall related with the Internet network between the clients and the web server [see Figs. 1-2]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of placing clients behind the firewall, disclosed by Bakshi, into the exchanging information system with CoWeb server disclosed by Jacobs, in order to enhance the system security aspect for protecting data transmission from being accessed by unauthorized users.

Regarding claim 19, Jacobs and Anupam do not explicitly teach co-navigation is performed in a secure manner. However, Bakshi, in the same field of collaborative network endeavor, discloses the use of firewall related with the Internet network between the clients and the web server [see Figs. 1-2]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of placing clients behind the firewall, disclosed by Bakshi, into the exchanging information system with CoWeb server disclosed by Jacobs, in order to enhance the system security aspect for protecting data transmission from being accessed by unauthorized users. Thus, co-navigation is performed in a secure manner.

Regarding claim 32, Jacobs and Anupam do not explicitly co-navigation is performed in a secure manner. However, Bakshi, in the same field of collaborative network endeavor, discloses the use of firewall related with the Internet network between the clients and the web server [see Figs. 1-2]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of placing clients behind the firewall, disclosed by Bakshi, into the exchanging information system with CoWeb server disclosed by Jacobs, in order to enhance the system security aspect for protecting data transmission from being accessed by unauthorized users. Thus, co-navigation is performed in a secure manner.

4. Claims 7, 12, 21 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs et al (Hereafter, Jacobs), "Filling HTML Forms Simultaneously : CoWeb - Architecture and Functionality", Computer Networks and ISDN Systems, NL, North Holland Publishing, Amsterdam, Vol. 28, No. 7-11, pages 1385-1395, May 1996 in view of Anupam et al (Hereafter, Anupam), U.S. Pat. No. 6,360,250 and further in view of Fox et al (Hereafter, Fox), U.S. Pat. No. 6,654,786.

Regarding claim 7, Jacobs further teaches the method of claim 1 wherein enabling the at least two clients to co-navigate includes presenting the at least one web document to the at least two clients (i.e., passing document to the clients) [see Sec. 3.2.3]. Jacobs and Anupam do not explicitly teach submitting responses received from any of the at least two clients to the web site. However, Jacobs does suggest communication messages between the clients or the information needed to synchronize the cooperating clients are passed through the CoWeb server [see Sec. 3.1].

Fox, in the same field of collaborative network endeavor, discloses bi-directional communication between the clients and the web server via the proxy for request/response of information [see Figs. 2 and 4]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate bi-directional communication between the clients and the web server via the proxy, disclosed by Fox, into the exchanging information system with CoWeb server disclosed by Jacobs, in order to maintain two-way communication

between the clients and the web server for efficiently handling of request and response of web document.

Regarding claim 12, Jacobs and Anupam do not explicitly teach submitting responses further includes receiving a web response from any of the at least two clients, converting the web response to a web request, and transferring the web request to the web site. However, Jacobs does suggest communication messages between the clients or the information needed to synchronize the cooperating clients are passed through the CoWeb server [see Sec. 3.1].

Fox, in the same field of collaborative network endeavor, discloses bi-directional communication between the clients and the web server via the proxy for request/response of information [see Figs. 2 and 4]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate bi-directional communication between the clients and the web server via the proxy, disclosed by Fox, into the exchanging information system with CoWeb server disclosed by Jacobs, in order to maintain two-way communication between the clients and the web server for efficiently handling of request and response of web document.

Regarding claim 21, Jacobs and Anupam do not explicitly teach any of the at least two clients are connected to the proxy via a wireless carrier. However, Fox, in the same field of collaborative network endeavor, discloses the use of wireless carrier network such as CDPD, CDMA, GSM, TD, etc. [see Figs. 1-2]. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate implementation of a wireless carrier network between the clients and the web server via the proxy, disclosed by Fox, into the exchanging information system with CoWeb server disclosed by Jacobs, in order to enhance the system by allowing multiple users communicate with each others from remote area wherein the wired network is not available.

Regarding claim 33, Jacobs and Anupam do not explicitly teach any of the at least two clients are connected to the co-navigation service via a wireless carrier. However, Fox, in the same field of collaborative network endeavor, discloses the use of wireless carrier network such as CDPD, CDMA, GSM, TD, etc. [see Figs. 1-2]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate implementation of a wireless carrier network between the clients and the web server via the co-navigation service, disclosed by Fox, into the exchanging information system with CoWeb server disclosed by Jacobs, in order to enhance the system by allowing multiple users communicate with each others from remote area wherein the wired network is not available.

5. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs et al (Hereafter, Jacobs), "Filling HTML Forms Simultaneously : CoWeb - Architecture and Functionality", Computer Networks and ISDN Systems, NL, North Holland Publishing, Amsterdam, Vol. 28, No. 7-11, pages 1385-1395, May

1996 in view of Anupam et al (Hereafter, Anupam), U.S. Pat. No. 6,360,250 and further in view of Devine et al (Hereafter, Devine), U.S. Pat. No. 6,606,708.

Regarding claim 27, Jacobs and Anupam do not explicitly teach the co-navigation service comprises a routing server to manage web requests, load balancing and routing at least one application server to maintain a plurality of shared sessions and a database server to authenticate participants of the plurality of shared sessions and store information related to each of the plurality of shared sessions. However, Jacobs does suggest CoWeb server manages all communication between the clients to allow several clients to participate in a CoWeb session connected to the web server via the CoWeb server [see Fig. 2 and Sec. 3.1.3] and co-navigation of at least one web document with dynamic content by the at least two clients during the shared session by providing collaborative web page navigation for CoWeb clients and guaranteeing that all users deal with the same state of the document [see Abstract and Secs. 3.1.3 and 3.2.4].

Devine, in the same field of collaborative network endeavor, discloses managing load balancing for maintaining efficient session connection load between client users and server and performing authentication of the users [see Abstract]. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate implementation of load balancing connection sessions and authentication of users involving communication sessions between clients and server, disclosed by Devine, into the exchanging information system with CoWeb server disclosed by Jacobs, in order to enhance

the system by maintaining a plurality of collaborative sessions in a secured manner.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 10-11 and 28-31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statements of reason for allowance : The above mentioned claims are allowable over the prior art of record does not appear to teach or render obvious the claimed limitations in combination with the specific added limitations as recited in independent claims and subsequent dependent claims. The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest a method and system for exchanging information over a communication network to enabling co-navigation of document with dynamic content during the shared session wherein modifying the web document with dynamic content associated with one or more references to the web site with one or more references to the proxy including incorporation of business rule into the web document when the business rule applied to the web document and replacement all references to a top frame in the web document with a code referencing a frame which would be the top window had the web document not been loaded in a co-navigation session. In addition, the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest the co-navigation service comprises application server that includes several components for maintaining a plurality of shared sessions in combination with at least one server integration

application programming interface (API) to provide an interface between the co-navigation service and at least one third party system.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9-21 and 24-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Other References Cited

8. The following references cited by the examiner but not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A) Hanson et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,505,233, discloses communicating information among a group of participants by adding content to dynamic content and updating dynamic content to the server for access by participants.

B) Rust, U.S. Pat. No. 6,668,273, discloses collaborative web browsing session wherein dynamic content is transmitted for displaying and viewing by participants.

C) Gupta, U.S. Pat. No. 6,446,109, discloses collaborative communication between clients and server via proxy for request/response of information from the web server with load-balancing and authentication functionalities.

D) Quatrano et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,675,216, discloses collaborations among clients and server for sharing dynamic content.

9. A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS, OR THIRTY DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. FAILURE TO RESPOND WITHIN THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE WILL CAUSE THE APPLICATION TO BECOME ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). EXTENSIONS OF TIME MAY BE OBTAINED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF 37 CAR 1.136(A).

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-8767. The Group fax phone number is (703) 872-9306.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam, can be reached on (703) 308-6662.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Philip Tran

Philip B. Tran
Art Unit 2155
Jan 22, 2004